

REMARKS

The Office Action of November 23, 2004 has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the application has been amended as set forth above. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 were rejected as being anticipated by (unpatentable over) Smentek. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As recited in claim 1, for example, a plurality of sub-clocking signals change from a power-up rest condition to a *free running condition* one at a time following an initial switch-on of a digital processing apparatus. The free running nature of the sub-clocks is illustrated in Figure 2 of the specification, for example. Such is not the case with Smentek.

Rather, in Smentek, signals FIRE1-FIRE8 are generated sequentially. These signals are "single-shot" signals as illustrated in Figure 2 of Smentek; they are not *free running* sub-clocks as in the present invention.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-10 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: February 14, 2005